BIBLIOTHECA INDICA
A COLLECTION OF ORIENTAL WORKS

मनुस्मृतिः

मेधातिथिरचित–'मनुभाष्य'–समेता

MANU-SMṚTI

WITH THE 'MANUBHĀṢYA' OF MEDHĀTITHI

INDEX OF VERSES

BY
MAHĀMAHOPĀDHYĀYA GAṄGĀNĀTHA JHĀ,
M.A., D.LITT., LL.D.

Work Number
256
Vol. III



Issue Number
1533
New Series

(Concluding Volume)

ALLAHABAD:
Printed at the Indian Press, Ltd.
Published by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1, Park Street,
Calcutta
1939

Price Rs. 2/-

NOTICE

BIBLIOTHECA INDICA

PUBLISHED BY

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL

The Bibliotheca Indica is a collection of works belonging to or treating of Oriental literatures and contains original text editions as well as translations into English, and also bibliographies, dictionaries, grammars, and studies.

The publication was started in 1849, and consists of an Old and a New Series. The New Series was begun in 1860, and is still running.

The issues in the series consisted originally of fascicles of 96 or 100 pages print, though occasionally numbers were issued of double, triple or larger bulk, and in a few cases even entire works were published under a single issue number. Of late years the single issues are made as much as possible to constitute complete volumes. Several different works are always simultaneously in progress. Each issue bears a consecutive issue number. The Old Series consists of 265 issues; in the New Series, till January 1st, 1939, inclusive, 1,521 issues have been published. These 1,786 issues represent 254 different works; these works again represent the following literatures:—

Sanskrit, Prakrit.

Rājasthānī, Kāshmīrī, Hindī

Tibetan.

Arabic, Persian.

Several works published are partly or wholly sold out, others are still incomplete and in progress. A few works, though incomplete, have been discontinued.

Two price-lists concerning the Bibliotheca Indica are available and may be had on application. One describes the Indian and the other the Islamic works published in the series. These lists are periodically revised.

The standard sizes of the Bibliotheca Indica are three:—

Demy (or small) octavo.

Royal (or large) octavo.

Quarto.

The prices of the Bibliotheca Indica as revised in 1923 are based (with some exceptions) on the following scale per unit of 96 or 100 pages in a fascicle as the case may be:—

BIBLIOTHECA INDICA

WORK No. 256

MANU-SMṚTI

WITH THE 'MANUBHĀṢYA' OF MEDHĀTITHI

(INDEX OF VERSES)

मनुस्मृति

मेधातिथिरचित–'मनुभाष्य'–समेता

MANU-SMRTI

WITH THE 'MANUBHĀSYA' OF MEDHĀTITHI

INDEX OF VERSES

BY
MAHĀMAHOPĀDHYĀYA GAṄGĀNĀTHA JHĀ,
M.A., D.LITT., LL.D.

Volume III

PRINTED AT THE INDIAN PRESS, LTD., ALLAHABAD
PUBLISHED BY THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL

CALCUTTA
1939

FOREWORD

The Society's edition of Manu-smṛti with the 'Manubhāṣya' of Medhātithi, edited with the help of several manuscripts by Mahāmahopādhyāya Gaṅgānātha Jhā, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D, in our *Bibliotheca Indica* series, has just been completed by the issue of this Volume III.

It was originally designed to publish the entire work in one or at the most in two volumes. But unfortunately due to errors in printing over which the Society had no direct supervision (the book being printed at Allahabad), the work had to be split up finally into three volumes, as follows :—

(1) Volume I consists of *adhyāyas* one to six, and is page-numbered from 1 to 533. It was published in 1932.

(2) Volume II consists of *adhyāyas* seven to twelve, and is page-numbered from 1 to 493. It has been published in the middle of this year (1939).

(3) Volume III consists of a short Introductory note in Sanskrit-*Upôdghāta* (in pp. 1 and 2), and an Editor's Apologia in English (in pp. 1 to 4), and an Index of Verses to Volumes I and II (in pp. 1 to 101). It has also been published in this year (1939).

The references to key words of verses in the two volumes are indicated by *adhyāyas* and *śloka* numbers in the index and not by page references.

The Society appreciates the help that the learned editor has so kindly rendered by editing this work in its *Bibliotheca Indica* series.

B. S. Guha,
Hony. General Secretary,
Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.

August 12, 1939,
1, *Park Street, Calcutta.*

॥ श्रीः ॥

मेधातिथिरचितमनुभाष्यसहितमनुस्मृतेरुपोद्घातः

मेधातिथेर्ग्रन्थोऽद्भुतदुर्दैववशं गतोऽस्ति । ग्रन्थनिर्माणानन्तरं प्रायशः शताब्दद्वयमध्य एवास्य पुस्तकं दुष्प्रापमिव बभूव । पश्चात् कश्चिन्मदननामा भूपतिरस्य जीर्णोद्धारं कारयामास । तथा च पुस्तकान्तेऽयं श्लोक उपलभ्यते—

मान्या काऽपि मनुस्मृतिस्तदुचिता व्याख्याऽपि मेधातिथेः
सा लुप्तैव विधेर्वशात् क्वचिदपि प्राप्यं न तत्पुस्तकम् ।
क्षोणीन्द्रो मदनः सहारणसुतो देशान्तरादाहृतै-
र्जीर्णोद्धारमचीकरत्तत इतस्तत्पुस्तकैर्लेखितैः ॥ इति

किन्त्वनया जीर्णोद्धारप्रक्रियया ग्रन्थस्य संहारः कृत इव प्रतिभाति । समुपलब्धानाम्मया द्वादशादर्शपुस्तकानामेकैव मातृका इति स्पष्टम् । अतोऽधुनोक्तजीर्णोद्धारविषयभूतमेवग्रन्थस्वरूपं समुपलभ्यत इत्यपि प्रतिभाति । जीर्णोद्धारकर्ता च स्वकार्ये नातीव पटुरासीदथवा न समीचीनयत्नपरो बभूवेत्यपि समुपलब्धपुस्तकेषु सर्वेषु ग्रन्थांशानां बहुत्रेतस्ततः समुचितादन्यत्र प्रदेशेषु समावेशेन सूचितम् ।

कृतेपि मुद्रणे वारद्वयमस्य ग्रन्थस्य दुरवस्था तदवस्थैवासीदित्यपि दुनोति चेतः ।

दुर्दैवहतस्यास्य पुनर्मुद्रणे यत् साहसं कृतं तत्समर्थनाय यत्नो विधेयो भवति । अस्य भाष्यस्याङ्गलभाषयाऽनुवादे नियुक्तोऽहं श्रद्धास्पदविद्वज्जनजीवातुश्रीमदाशुतोषमुखोपाध्यायाधिष्ठितेन कलकत्ताविश्वविद्यालयेन । अनुवादसम्पादनात् प्राक्च ग्रन्थस्वरूपनिर्धारणमावश्यकमासीत् । बहुनायासेन कथंकथमपि ग्रन्थो यथाकथञ्चिद् बोधार्हपाठः कृतः । अनुवादप्रकाशनानन्तरं तेनैव महाशयेनादिष्टं यदेतावता प्रयासेन यद् बोधार्हरूपं ग्रन्थस्य सम्पादितं तस्य प्रकाशनं मूलमात्राध्यायिनामुपकारकं भविष्यतीति । एतन्मुद्रणस्यापि प्रबन्धस्तेनैव महात्मना 'एशियाटिक सोसाइटी'-नाम्न्याः परिषदः सकाशात् कृतः ।

एवं कृतेऽपि यत्ने ग्रन्थस्तत्त्वतः स्वनैसर्गिकं रूपं प्राप्त इति सन्दिग्धमेव वर्तते । किन्तु प्राक्तनयोः संस्करणयोरपेक्षया सुबोधतरमिदं सम्पन्नमिति सन्तोषकारणम् । अत्र च विद्वांस एव प्रमाणम् ।

मनुभाष्य एव समुपलब्धानामक्षराणामाधारेण मेधातिथिविषये यत् किञ्चिज्ज्ञायते तद्विस्तरशः सङ्कलितमाङ्गलभाषानुवादभूमिकायाम्। अत्र केवलं तन्निष्कर्षमात्रं प्रदर्श्यते। तद्यथा—

अस्य समयः—ऐशवीया नवमी शताब्दी।

जन्मभूमिः—काश्मीरो बाह्लीको वा।

ग्रन्थान्तरम्—स्मृतिविवेकः।

कृतेऽपि यत्ने मया तथा च श्रीमता उमेशमिश्रेण—अयं ग्रन्थः सर्वाङ्गसुबोधो न बभूवेति दूयत एव चेतः। अतो विद्वांसः कृपाकटाक्षक्षेपेणैवावलोकयन्त्वमुमित्यपि प्रार्थनीयम्भवति—इति।

प्रयाग,
आषाढशुक्लनवम्याम्बुधे
संवत् १९९२

विदुषां वशंवदः
श्रीगङ्गानाथझा शर्म्मा

EDITOR'S APOLOGIA.

A few words are needed for explaining the genesis of this edition of Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya.*

The vicissitudes undergone by this *Bhāṣya* would appear to be unique in the history of Sanskrit Literature. The work was written, probably, in the 9th century, and yet as early as the 14th century, manuscripts of it were 'not to be found'—क्वचिदपि प्राप्यं न तत्पुस्तकम् ; and it was restored by a king named Madana, who has been identified with the king under whose patronage the *Madanapārījāta* and *Madanavivoda* were written. This King was at Dīgh, who is believed to have lived in the 14th century. Not finding any manuscripts of the *Manubhāṣya,*—that is, apparently, not having got any complete or reliable manuscripts of it,—he got done by his court Pandits, what is called its *Jīrṇoddhāra,*—as stated by Buhler in his Introduction to *Manu* (in the *Sacred Books of the East Series*). Curiously enough, though he lived in India for sometime, Buhler did not know what the term '*Jīrṇoddhāra*' stands for in this country. He says (on p. CXXV of the Introduction to his translation of Manu) —"I can only agree with Prof. Jolly that Madanapāla did not cause the *Bhāyṣa* to be recomposed, but merely completed the defective MSS. of his library from a copy purchased in some other part of India."—All this about the *Jīrṇoddhāra,* we learn only from the following verse which is found at the end of some chapters of some manuscripts of the work now available ; but a little pondering over this verse will show that what was done to the text at the court of Madana was something very different from what has been supposed by Jolly and Buhler. The *Shloka* runs as follows :—

मान्या काऽपि मनुस्मृतिस्तदुचिता व्याख्याऽपि मेधातिथेः
सा लुप्तैव विधेर्वशात् क्वचिदपि प्राप्यन्न तत्पुस्तकम् ।
क्षोणीन्द्रो मदनः सहारणसुतो देशान्तरादाहृतै-
र्जीर्णोद्धारमचीकरत् तत इतस्तत्पुस्तकैर्लेखितैः ॥

The statements contained herein are the following :—

(1) 'The Smriti of Manu is a revered work' ;—(2) 'The commentary on it by Medhātithi is right and proper' ;—(3) 'Through fate, it has become lost' ;—(4) 'Its manuscript is nowhere to be found' ;—(5) 'The King Madana has got the *Jīrṇoddhāra* of it done with the help of manuscripts collected from another place.'

This would be very different from 'merely completing the defective manuscripts of his library from a copy purchased in some other part of India'. It would be clear to every manuscript-collector in India that—(1) the King wished to have a copy of the *Bhāṣya* ;—(2) he did not find anywhere a complete copy—क्वचिदपि प्राप्यं न तत्पुस्तकम् ; (3)—from various parts of the country, he got what were mere fragments—some odd stray leaves, *patrās*, it would seem—of the work ;—(4) these fragments he got collated into what he believed to be a complete whole.—This would be the '*uddhāra*' —Saving from destruction,—of what was '*jīrna*', decayed *dilapidated* ; by which term is clearly meant—*torn edges* of the leaves, and the consequent disappearance of the leaf-numberings, and such other damages as all who deal with old MSS. are conversant with.—This would be very different from the *completing* of a copy wanting in certain parts. Curiously enough, Buhler himself has used the correct term on page CXXV—' restoration.'

This 'restored text' is what has come down to us ; all the manuscripts that have been found so far are found to have their source in this 'restored' text ; and they are all corrupt, in places very nearly unintelligible,—specially where the *Bhāṣya* is a long one. As all the manuscripts suffer from these defects, it would seem that the 'restoration' was done either carelessly or by incompetent hands. The work has suffered most in its longer parts, and this leads to the conclusion that the older leaves of which the numbering had disappeared were, in restoration,

placed in wrong places. In several places, this is quite clear; what appears under one text should have appeared under a text several steps lower down.—Buhler has justly described the condition of the MSS. in the following words :—

"All the copies of Medhātīthi which I have seen or used are throughout more or less corrupt, in some parts, specially in chapters VIII & IX, as well as at the end of chapter XII, in a desperate condition. The latter portion is, in fact confusion, some pieces being missing and others being given twice over. In chapters VIII & IX, many verses are left out, though it is evident from cross-references and from remarks made by Kulluka that they must have been explained by Medhātīthi. In the parts of the commentary still extant, the corruptions are often very bad and the sense frequently doubtful, or only to be made out conjecturally."

I know from bitter experience that this is too true. I have been compelled to rectify some of the most glaring defects,—specially the one relating to the misplacing of portions of the *Bhāṣya*,—and it is hoped that the text presented here is more understandable than that presented by the manuscripts or even by the two printed editions.

The *Bhāṣya* was printed for the first time under the supervision of Rao Sahib Vishvanath Narayan Mandlik, along with several other commentaries on Manu,—all that could be got at the time.—A second edition was brought out by Professor Gharpure of Poona; and the ill-luck of the work seems to have pursued it there, and we are told the entire stock of his publications was consumed by fire.

Some sort of an edition therefore appeared to be called for; and as I had done the English translation of the *Bhāṣya* for the Calcutta University,—which has been published in eight volumes, 5 volumes of *Text* and three volumes of *Notes*,—the late Sir Ashutush Mukherji suggested it to the Bengal Asiatic

Society that as some sort of a readable and understandable text had been evolved in course of the translation, and as copies of this text were not accessible, it would be well to publish the text as prepared by me, which would appear to be the best way of preserving the text of the *Bhāṣya*. I may mention here that the more important of the emendations accepted by me mostly on the strength of manuscripts, have been noted in Part I of the Notes appended to my English Translation

Though the present edition is an improvement upon King Madana's 'Restoration' and Mandlik's 'Edition,' yet it is far from satisfactory : and if MS.—hunters will bear this work in mind in course of thier 'hunts,' we may yet hope to secure a reliable manuscript which may be prior to the 'restoration' by King Madana.

"MITHILA'
ALLAHABAD
July 25, 1935.

GANGANATHA JHA.

मनुस्मृतिश्लोकानां पादतः अकारादिवर्णानुसारेण सूची

[अध्यापक–घारपुरेमहाशयानुसारिणी]

———

